

REMARKS

Claims 1-7 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claim is amended. No new matter is added by this Amendment as support can be found at least on page 7, lines 20 and 21, of Applicants' specification. Reconsideration of the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The courtesies extended to Applicants' representative by Examiner Jacobs and Examiner Tamai at the interview held October 11, 2007, are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the Remarks below and constitute Applicants' record of the interview.

The specification has been amended to obviate informalities.

The Office Action rejects claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/00507052 to Katsuzawa et al. (hereinafter "Katsuzawa") in view of JP No. 06-1214962 to Takao; rejects claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Katsuzawa in view of Takao, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,465,016 to Manel et al. (hereinafter "Manel"); rejects claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Katsuzawa in view of Takao, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0047363 to Kloeppel et al. (hereinafter "Kloeppel"); rejects claims 4 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Katsuzawa in view of Takao, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0024749 to Kobayashi et al. (hereinafter "Kobayashi"); rejects claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Katsuzawa in view of Takao and Manel, and further in view of Kobayashi; and rejects claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Katsuzawa in view of Takao and Kloeppel, and further in view of Kobayashi. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

The Office Action asserts the combination of Katsuzawa and Takao teach all the features recited in independent claim 1. This assertion is incorrect. The applied references do not teach, or would have suggested, a motor module including at least "a motor winding, corresponding to a lead wire for externally connecting a coil of a stator, having been subjected to varnish treatment," as recited in amended claim 1.

The Office Action concedes that Katsuzawa does not teach or suggest the motor winding being subject to varnish treatment and relies on Takao to make up for the above-noted deficiency. However, Takao, in paragraph [0020], teaches that varnish 7 infiltrates into the stator core 2 and winding 3 while it is prevented from infiltrating into lead cable 4. Additionally, Takao, in paragraph [0009], discusses a self-using and fixing insulator designed to prevent the cable line from being coated. Furthermore, paragraph [0007] explains that cable line 4 should not be covered in varnish because the cable line may lose flexibility.

However, even if Takao teaches the lead cable 4 is varnished, when Takao is combined with Katsuzawa the combination of the references do not teach, nor would have suggested, "said motor winding is connected to said internal conductor via a flexible member that is conductive and that is higher than said motor winding in flexibility," as recited in claim 1. Instead, the combination of the references would teach a uniform varnish. Katsuzawa teaches that lead 7 is uniformly structured and its flexibility is uniform and does not suggest having a low flexibility portion and a high flexibility portion. Therefore, the combination of the references do not teach or suggest "said motor winding is connected to said internal conductor via a flexible member that is conductive and that is higher than said motor winding in flexibility," as recited in claim 1.

Manel, Kloeppel and Kobayashi fail to teach or suggest the above features, and therefore, fail to make up for the above-noted deficiencies of Katsuzawa and Takao.

For at least the reasons above, the applied references cannot reasonably be considered to teach or to have suggested the combinations of all the features recited in at least independent claim 1. Further, claims 2-7 would also not have been suggested by the applied references for at least the respective dependency of these claims on allowable independent claim 1, as well as for the separately patentable subject matter that each of these claims recites.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-7 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Tiffany J. Brooks
Registration No. 57,912

JAO:TJB/wkb

Attachment:
Petition for Extension of Time

Date: November 6, 2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION**

Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;

Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461